

The Attributive Use and the Semantic Functions of *Whoever*-clauses^{*}

Chiaki KUMAMOTO

Summary

Both *it* and *s/he* appear in the *whoever*-clause added to a sentence with an attributively used definite NP (henceforth ADNP) as its subject. This suggests that an ADNP has a property that is compatible with both the function of specification and the function of identification. It is argued that an ADNP represents the result of specification, which implies the act of specification. It is also argued that the notion of degree of identification is useful in distinguishing the type of information required for the identification of the referent of an ADNP from that required for the identification of the referent of a referentially used definite NP (henceforth RDNP).

I. Introduction

This paper aims to clarify the semantic function of a *whoever*-clause added to a sentence with an ADNP, taking notice of the pronoun that appears in the clause. We are concerned here with the following types of sentences:

- (1) The Ferrari driver, *whoever he is*, has an unfair advantage. (George Powell 1999: 103)
- (2) The winner of the race, *whoever it turns out to be*, plays right wing, be it Fred, Derek, or even Jacob. (Barwise and Perry 1983: 153)

Assuming that *whoever he is* declares the irrelevance of identification and *whoever it is*, the irrelevance of specification, we must explain why both pronouns can appear in the *whoever*-clause added to a sentence with an ADNP as its subject. I will show the need to distinguish not only between specification and identification but also between different degrees of identification, in order to explain how a *whoever*-clause functions with an ADNP.

II. The Attributive / Referential Distinction

First, however, I would like to clear up some of the misunderstandings concerning the notion of ADNP. Although the distinction between the referential use and the attributive use of

definite descriptions has been widely discussed, the essential property of an ADNP itself has been left misleadingly vague. One reason for this is that the definition of the attributive use is based on elusive notions such as “not having a particular person in mind” or “whatever or whoever fits the description”. Donnellan (1966) contrasts the attributive use and the referential use as in (3) and (4):

- (3) A speaker who uses a definite description attributively in an assertion states something about *whoever or whatever is the so-and-so...* (In this case,) the definite description might be said to occur essentially, for the speaker wishes to assert something about *whatever or whoever fits that description*. (Donnellan 1966 (1991): 54, emphasis mine)
- (4) A speaker who uses a definite description referentially in an assertion ... uses the description to enable his audience to pick out whom or what he is talking about and states something about that person or thing. (Donnellan 1966 (1991): 54)

One of the examples Donnellan gives to explain the distinction between the two uses is (5):

- (5) Smith's murderer is insane. (Donnellan 1966 (1991): 54)

Suppose first that the speaker utters (5) coming upon poor Smith brutally murdered. In this case, the speaker has no particular person in mind and thus the definite description *Smith's murderer* is used attributively. Suppose next that the speaker says (5) looking at Jones who has been charged with Smith's murder and who behaves in a strange way at his trial. In this case, the speaker uses *Smith's murderer* to refer to Jones and thus the definite description is used referentially.

Another example Donnellan gives intending to illustrate the same distinction is (6):

- (6) Who is the man drinking a martini? (Donnellan 1966 (1991): 55)

Donnellan explains the two uses in a similar way. Suppose one is at a party and, seeing an interesting-looking person holding a martini glass, he asks, “Who is the man drinking a martini?” In this situation, the speaker's question is aimed at a specific person and thus he is using the definite NP *the man drinking a martini* referentially. In contrast, suppose that the chairman of the local Teetotalers Union, who has been informed that a man is drinking a martini at their annual party, responds by asking the question in (6). In asking this question, the speaker does not have any particular person in mind about whom he asks the question, and thus he is using the definite NP attributively.

All this explanation seems fairly convincing at a first glance, but more careful consideration suggests that the property of the definite NP in (5) and that of the definite NP in (6) are not quite the same when they are said to be used “attributively.” The fact that Donnellan confuses a totally different type of NP with an ADNP is extensively discussed in Kumamoto (1993) and

Nishiyama (1997).

First, let us make sure that ADNPs are *referential* in a broad sense, namely, in the sense that they refer to entities in the world. In (7), Donnellan himself admits that ADNPs are used to *refer*, although weakly.

- (7) Russell thought ... that whenever we use descriptions, as opposed to proper names, we introduce an element of generality which ought to be absent if what we are doing is referring to some particular thing ... If there is anything which might be identified as reference here, it is *reference in a very weak sense—namely, reference to whatever is the one and only one ϕ if there is any such*. Now this is something we might well say about *the attributive use of definite descriptions ...* (Donnellan 1966 (1991): 62, emphasis mine)

As it is contrasted with the term “a *referential* use” in his terminology, the term “an *attributive* use” gives a wrong impression that it is not referential at all. The claim that ADNPs are in fact *referential* will be crucial for the later discussion.

Next, let us consider what types of copular sentences (5) and (6) are in attributive and referential readings to examine the function of the definite NP in each sentence. See (8):

- | | |
|---|--------------------|
| (8) Smith's murderer is insane. | 'Smith's murderer' |
| referential reading: predication sentence | RDNP (referential) |
| attributive reading: predication sentence | ADNP (referential) |

The sentence *Smith's murderer is insane* is unambiguously a predication sentence in either the referential reading or the attributive reading. A predication sentence is a sentence that has the function of predicating something of the referent of the subject NP. Higgins (1979: 212–213) states that for a predication sentence to “fulfill the function of introducing a topic and then saying something about it”, there must be an object referred to by the subject NP “in advance of the assertion about it”. The sentence *Who is the man drinking a martini?*, on the other hand, is identificational in the referential reading and specificational in the alleged attributive reading.¹⁾ See (9):

- | | |
|---|--|
| (9) Who is the man drinking a martini? | 'the man drinking a martini' |
| referential reading: identificational sentence | RDNP (referential) |
| alleged attributive reading: specificational sentence | superscriptional NP / NPiv
(noun phrase involving a variable) (non-referential) |

An identificational sentence is a sentence that provides further information about the referent of the subject NP to create full identification (Declerck 1988: 96). Even if it has not been fully

We need a detailed discussion about the characterization of specificational sentences. Additional examples of specificational sentences are given in (10):

- Although a number of linguists support the view that specificational sentences specify a value for a variable (Higgins 1979, Declerck 1988, Nishiyama 1997 *inter alia*), they do not necessarily agree about the property of a variable NP. Declerck, for example, takes the variable NP of a specificational sentence to be an ADNP in Donnellan's sense and claims that it is weakly referential. Higgins, on the other hand, emphasizes the non-referential character of the subject NP of a specificational sentence. He calls the subject NP which represents a variable "a superscriptional NP" and argues that superscriptional NPs and ADNPs should be clearly distinguished to explain the ambiguity of sentence (11).² Three out of eight possible readings of (11) which Higgins offers are given in (12):

- Nishiyama (1997, 2003) shares with Higgins the view that the variable NP in a specificational sentence is not referential and thus cannot be taken to be an ADNP. Nishiyama proposes the notion of NP_{IV} (noun phrase involving a variable) to explain the property of a variable NP. It is a one-place predicate with a variable to which the value is to be assigned, with the predicate closely related to a WH-question at the level of semantic representation or a logical form (Nishiyama 1997). According to Nishiyama (1997), the subject NPs of specificational sentences (13a) and (13b) bear the same relation to question (14),

- (13=(10)) a. The man drinking a martini is John White.
 b. The man drinking a martini is the man standing in front of the door.
 (14) Which one is the man drinking a martini?

as the object NPs of sentences (15a-c) do to the corresponding sentential interrogative complements.

- (15) a. George remembered *the number of planets*. (=what the number of planets was)
 b. Mary guessed *the price of eggs*. (=what the price of eggs was)
 c. Fred refused to tell the police *the fellow who had been involved*. (=which fellows had been involved) (Baker 1968: 83)

These arguments by Higgins and Nishiyama are convincing. The definite NP *the man drinking a martini* in the sentence *Who is the man drinking a martini?* interpreted specificationally is non-referential, and therefore cannot be an ADNP. Although Donnellan's vague characterization of the attributive use appears to allow subsuming different types of NPs, it is untenable to group together referential and non-referential NPs under the same rubric. I will use Nishiyama's terminology hereafter and refer to a variable NP as an NP_{IV}.

III. The *Wh.ever* Test

Now that we have distinguished cases of NP_{IV} from genuine cases of ADNP, let us consider another aspect of the characterization of ADNPs, that is, the claim that an ADNP can be paraphrased with a *wh.ever*-clause. Stampe explains this aspect in the following way:

- (16) To use a definite description attributively in a sentence (the *f* is *g*) is to use it in such a way as to convey, or implement the intention of conveying, the same thing that would be conventionally and expressly conveyed by the same sentence with the appropriate *wh.ever*-clause prefixed to it (*wh.ever* it may be that is the *f*, the *f* is *g*) (Stampe 1974: 182)

Actually, it is a common practice to add a *wh.ever*-clause to a definite NP to make it explicit that the NP is used attributively. See the examples below:

- (17) They don't know [the answer to the question] Who murdered Smith. But WHOEVER HE IS, the murderer of Smith must be insane. (Stampe 1974: 171)
 (18) Whoever it may be who is the murderer of Smith, the murderer of Smith is insane. (Stampe 1974: 171)

- (19=(2)) The winner of the race, whoever it turns out to be, plays right wing, be it Fred, Derek, or even Jacob. (Barwise and Perry 1983: 153)
- (20) The grand prize winner {of the Sweepstakes} (whoever s/he turns out to be) will win an all-expenses-paid trip for two to the Bahamas. (Bezuidenhout 1997: 395-396)

The close relation between an ADNP and a *wh.ever*-clause is unarguable, but we have to bear in mind that the compatibility with a *wh.ever*-clause is not only a characteristic of ADNPs. As we can see in (21) and (22), a *wh.ever*-clause can also be added to a sentence with an RDNP as its subject.

- (21) They've arrested the murderer, but they don't know who he is [that is, the answer to the question Who is the man who they know to have murdered Smith]. But WHOEVER HE IS, even if he's the son of the governor) the murderer of Smith will get the chair. (Stampe 1974: 170)
- (22) This guy Heidegger, whoever he is, has won yet another race. (Searle 1971 (1991): 129)

Moreover, a *wh.ever*-clause can be added to sentences with an NPIV as their subject, as in (23)-(25):

- (23) Whoever it was who betrayed him, it (=the traitor) was the man they called "Sedan Chair". (Stampe 1974: 178)
- (24) Whatever the price of eggs is, it (=the price of eggs) is around 90 cents a dozen. (Stampe 1974: 177)
- (25) The new president, whoever it is, will be decided soon.

It is obvious from these observations that compatibility with a *wh.ever*-clause alone is not proof that the NP is an ADNP. We cannot rely solely on the compatibility with a *wh.ever*-clause to distinguish ADNPs from RDNPs and NPIVs. Here it is in order to consider if the *wh.ever*-clause serves one and the same function in all of the examples above. Stampe points out that there is a sharp contrast between the *wh.ever*-clause added to a sentence with an ADNP and the clause added to a sentence with an RDNP. He argues that the former expresses the irrelevance of having an answer to a subject wanting question exemplified by (26),

- (26) Who murdered Smith? (Stampe 1974: 166)

while the latter expresses the irrelevance of having an answer to a predicate wanting question exemplified by (27).

- (27) Who is that man, who is the man who murdered Smith? (Stampe 1974: 166)

We might rephrase the distinction as follows: the *wh.ever*-clause added to a sentence with an ADNP declares the irrelevance of the SPECIFICATION of the value that satisfies the variable whose existence is inferred from the ADNP; the *wh.ever*-clause added to a sentence with an RDNP, on the other hand, declares the irrelevance of the fuller IDENTIFICATION of the referent of the RDNP. It is plausible that in examples (17)-(20), the *wh.ever*-clause declares the irrelevance of specification, and in examples (21) and (22), the *wh.ever*-clause declares the irrelevance of identification. It is clear that what Stampe has in mind when he formulated (16) is the type of *wh.ever*-clause that is associated with the specification of a value. The other type of *wh.ever*-clause, namely, the one associated with the identification of a referent, does not fit in the characterization given in (16) and cannot be paraphrased as “*wh.ever* it may be that is the *f*”.

By excluding the identificational-type *wh.ever*-clause from our consideration and just concentrating on the specificational-type *wh.ever*-clause, then, can we say that (16) is an adequate characterization of an ADNP? This characterization is, in fact, seriously misleading. As Stampe regards the compatibility with the specificational type *wh.ever*-clause as a test for an ADNP, he wrongly takes what is actually an NP_{IV} to be an ADNP. Observe (23) and (24). The main clause of each of these sentences is a specificational copular sentence. As we have seen before, the subject NP of a specificational sentence is an NP_{IV}, which is quite distinct from an ADNP. According to the criterion given in (16), however, the definite NPs *the traitor* and *the price of eggs* are deemed to be ADNPs. Stampe states that where the predicate NP does not completely answer the subject wanting question, an *attributive* interpretation is possible. Compare (28) and (29) with (23) and (24).

(28)*Whoever it was who betrayed him, it (=the traitor) was Sedan Chair.

(Stampe 1974: 178)

(29)*Whatever the price of eggs is, it (=the price of eggs) is 90 cents a dozen.

(Stampe 1974: 176)

In (28) and (29), the main clause is a specificational sentence and the subject NP is an NP_{IV}, just as in (23) and (24). The only difference is that the exact value is specified by the predicate in (28) and (29), which makes the addition of a *wh.ever*-clause unacceptable in these examples. Although the subject NPs in (23) and (24) and those in (28) and (29) are equally NP_{IV}s, they are classified apart by Stampe's criterion. Stampe maintains that if the predicate *completely* answers the subject wanting question, it cannot be interpreted attributively. Therefore, the subject NPs *the traitor* and *the price of eggs* in (28) and (29) are, Stampe claims, not taken to be ADNPs.

As Stampe rightly argues, these NPs are not ADNPs. However, the reason is not furnished by the fact that the *wh.ever*-clause is incompatible with the way the predicate NP answers the question in these examples. The NPs are not ADNPs because they represent variables, and do not refer to any entity. Whether the addition of a *wh.ever*-clause is acceptable or

not, the use of a definite NP should be considered from the viewpoint of the semantic function it performs in the sentence. Stampe obviously overlooks the similarity in semantic function between the subject NPs of (23) and (24) on the one hand, and those of (28) and (29) on the other. At the same time, he overlooks the difference in semantic function between the subject NPs of (23) and (24) on the one hand, and those of (17) - (20) on the other. An argument of the uses of definite NPs based on the compatibility with a *wh.ever*-clause is thus problematic in that it classifies apart NPs with the same function and groups together NPs with different functions.

IV. The Selection of *It* or *S/He*

Having discussed the widespread misunderstanding concerning the attributive / referential distinction, I wish to turn to the main concern of this paper, namely, the use of the pronouns *it* and *s/he* in the *whoever*-clause added to a sentence with an ADNP as its subject. We have seen before that when a *wh.ever*-clause is connected with an RDNP, it declares the irrelevance of the identification of the referent of the NP; and that when the clause is connected with an ADNP, it declares the irrelevance of the specification of a value for the variable whose existence is inferred from the NP; and that when the clause is connected with an NP_{IV}, it declares the irrelevance of the specification of a value for the variable represented by the NP, sometimes implying that the exact, pin-point specification is what is irrelevant. When we review the examples given earlier, we find that the pronoun used in a *whoever*-clause is different depending on the type of definite NP it is anaphoric to. When the NP is an RDNP, the pronoun *s/he* is used; when the NP is an ADNP, both *it* and *s/he* are used; and when the NP is an NP_{IV}, the pronoun *it* is used. The contrast is clear in the examples below:

- (30) [They've arrested the murderer but they don't know who he is.] But whoever he / *it is (even if he's / *it's the son of the governor), the murderer of Smith will get the chair. (RDNP)
- (31) This guy Heidegger, whoever he /*it is, has won yet another race. (RDNP)
- (32) The Ferrari driver, whoever he / it is, has an unfair advantage. (ADNP)
- (33) I bet the winner of this year's Wimbledon men's singles title, whoever it / he is, also wins the US open. (ADNP)
- (34) I wonder if Mary's best friend, whoever it / s/he is, will forgive her betrayal. (ADNP)
- (35) The new president, whoever it / *he is, will be decided soon. (NP_{IV})
- (36) They don't know [the answer to the question] Who is the murderer. But whoever it / *he is, it is a certain mad man. (NP_{IV})

What distinction is reflected in the selection of a pronoun in the *whoever*-clause? Declerck (1988) explains the use of *it* versus *he* in (37)

- (37) a. (Who is your friend?=Tell me who is your friend.) - It is the son of the Prime Minister.
 b. (Who is your friend?=Tell me more about your friend.) - He is the son of the Prime Minister. (Declerck 1988: 125)

by assuming the two hypotheses given in (38):

- (38) i. *It*-sentences are specificational, whereas *he/she/they*-sentences are either descriptively-identifying or predicational.
 ii. Such *it*-sentences are reduced *it*-clefts. (Declerck 1988: 124)

Declerck argues that the *it*-sentence in (37a) is specificational and specifies a value (*the son of the Prime Minister*) for a variable (*the one who is my friend*), while the *he*-sentence in (37b) is descriptively-identifying and provides a further description of the referent of the subject NP so that fuller identification becomes possible after some elementary identification has been made by way of specification. In (39), specificational information is provided first and then descriptively-identifying information is supplied. He claims that the first answer to a question asking for identifying information is normally specificational. See examples below:

- (39) a. The girl asked us who was the new president.
 b. We told her that it was the man standing in the corner of the room. (specifically-identifying) (=specificational)
 c. She then asked us who he / that man was.
 d. We replied that he was the son of the former president. (descriptively-identifying) (=specificational) (Declerck 1988: 101)

Declerck gives the following example to support his claim that the selection of *it* or *s/he* depends on the type of information—specificational or identificational—that is being provided.

- (40) Last night a man was arrested by the London police and charged with the murder of Annie Jones. It was / He is Mr. James Smith, of Sweetham Street, Bexton. (Declerck 1988: 119)
 (41) The new general, he / it is a friend of the president. (Declerck 1988: 123)
 (42) It / *She was Alice, the one who just had the baby. (Gundel 1977: 555)
 (43) (Who is the murderer?) - It / *he is that old man that lives near the river. (Declerck 1988: 143)
 (44) Jack Smith, he / *it is a friend of mine. (Declerck 1988: 139)

If we admit, following Declerck, that the selection of a pronoun is determined by the type of information given in the sentence, we can explain why *it* is used in the *whoever*-clause added

to a sentence with an NPIV and *s/he* is used in the clause added to a sentence with an RDNP. In the former case, the clause declares the irrelevance of specificational information, and in the latter case, the clause declares the irrelevance of identificational information. What is left unexplained is the fact that both *it* and *s/he* can be used in the *whoever*-clause added to a sentence with an ADNP. Note in passing that Donnellan himself does not use either *whoever it is* or *whoever s/he is* in his explanation of an ADNP. In (3) and (7) he only uses such expressions as “whatever or whoever fits that description” and “whoever or whatever is the so-and-so”.³⁾

We have seen before that a *whoever*-clause used with an ADNP expresses the irrelevance of specificational information. If *it* has to be used in a specificational sentence, why does *s/he* appear in the *whoever*-clause which should be interpreted specifically? Should we assume that there is a special type of specificational sentence that has *s/he* as its subject? This may be an interesting solution, but it will have serious consequences for the theory of copular sentences. We do not want to abandon the distinction between referential NPs and non-referential NPs, which is correlated with the selection of pronouns. Or, should we reconsider the type of information given in the *whoever*-clause used with an ADNP and argue that either the irrelevance of specificational information or that of identificational information is expressed by the clause? If we choose this alternative, we have to find a way to distinguish the identificational information declared to be irrelevant in the case of RDNP and that declared to be irrelevant in the case of ADNP. These two types of identificational information seem to be substantially different.

The use of *it* in the *whoever*-clause added to a sentence with an ADNP is also problematic if looked at from another aspect. In (30) and (31), where the definite NP in question is an RDNP, the pronoun *he* in the *whoever*-clause is co-referential with *the murderer of Smith* and *this guy Heidegger*, respectively. In (35) and (36), where the definite NP is an NPIV, the pronoun *it* in the *whoever*-clause is anaphoric to *the new president* and *the murderer*, respectively. Also in (32)-(34), where the definite NP is an ADNP, the use of *s/he* does not cause any problem because the pronoun is co-referential with *the Ferrari driver*, *the winner of this year's Wimbledon men's singles title*, and *Mary's best friend*, respectively. However, if the pronoun *it* is selected in (32)-(34), we must ask what it is anaphoric to. It cannot be co-referential with the ADNP, because a variable NP is not referring. There is no NPIV which is to be related with the pronoun *it* in these sentences, either. We need a reasonable account of how the pronoun *it* is related to its possible antecedent.

Here I suggest that understanding the close relation of an ADNP to the notion of “value” is a key to explaining the use of both *it* and *s/he* in the *whoever*-clause added to a sentence with an ADNP. Although an ADNP is referential and not itself a variable NP, or an NPIV, it assumes the existence of a variable to which its referent has been assigned as a value. It is quite natural for an ADNP to be accompanied with anything that suggests the existence of a variable since an ADNP represents the result of specification. Consider the following examples again.

(45= (32)) The Ferrari driver, whoever he / it is, has an unfair advantage. (ADNP)

- (46= (33)) I bet the winner of this year's Wimbledon men's singles title, whoever it / he is, also wins the US open. (ADNP)

In these examples, the use of *he* suggests that specification has already taken place and that the assigned value, although not specific enough to indicate a particular individual, is being discussed. The use of *it*, on the other hand, suggests that specification is taking place and which value is to be assigned is being discussed. It is interesting to note that when *it* is used in (45), the sentence also means that the situation always arises. In this reading, a different value is assigned to the variable each time. (Cf. Nishiyama 2003) Some speakers prefer *it* in (46) because the result is not yet known and specification has not taken place. That the pronoun *it* has no explicit antecedent in the examples above does not seem to be too much of a problem when we find a more striking example like (47). Even if there is no mention of *the guy who was playing* which would serve as an antecedent, the pronouns *it* and *he* are acceptable in this example.

- (47) Hikaru: One time, there was a GO game on one of the computers. That's when I saw the chat between SAI and ZELDA. I remembered it because it was kind of funny.

Waya: Who was playing?

Hikaru: Whoever *it* was, *he* left too quickly. I never saw his face.

(*Hikaru no Go*. Game 56: emphasis mine)

As for the type of information given in the *whoever*-clause used with an ADNP, I assume that it need not be restricted to specificational information as discussed by Stampe (1974). We have just seen that when added to a sentence with an ADNP, *whoever it is* and *whoever s/he is* provide different suggestions as to the phase of specification: *whoever it is* suggests that specification is taking place and *whoever s/he is* suggests that specification has already taken place and the value has been assigned. The information *whoever it is* declares to be irrelevant is, of course, specificational, but the information *whoever s/he is* declares to be irrelevant should be called identificational. The former is related to the specification of a value for the variable whose existence is inferred from the ADNP, while the latter is related to the identification of the referent of the ADNP.

If we maintain that *whoever s/he is* used with an ADNP is identificational, then we have to explain how it is different from the clause used with an RDNP, which is also identificational.

Recall that a crucial difference between the referent of an RDNP and that of an ADNP is whether a particular individual is in the speaker's mind or not. In the case of ADNP, the only information available about its referent is that the referent fits the description; namely, it has been assigned as the value for the variable. It has not been associated with a particular individual. In the case of RDNP, on the other hand, the referent is a particular individual. Naturally the information necessary for fuller identification of the referent is different in each case. For

the identification of the referent of an ADNP, information that helps to associate it with a particular individual is required. It is expected that such information tends to be more entity-oriented. For the identification of the referent of an RDNP, in contrast, more detailed characterization of the individual is required. It is expected that such information tends to be more descriptive. An example of gradation of identificational information is given in (48):

(48) Who is the boy who wrote this email?

- a. The boy who wrote this email (He) is the boy standing over there.
- b. The boy who wrote this email (He) is a student named John White.
- c. The boy who wrote this email (He) is a student at Saga University.
- d. The boy who wrote this email (He) is a top student graduating soon.
- e. The boy who wrote this email (He) is a gentle student worried about interpersonal relations.

By taking into account the different degrees of identification, we can distinguish between the identificational information declared to be irrelevant in *whoever s/he is* used with an ADNP, and that declared to be irrelevant in *whoever s/he is* used with an RDNP.

V. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have seen how the selection of *it* versus *s/he* in *whoever*-clauses can be explained in relation to the semantic function of the definite NP with which the clause is used. It has been pointed out that understanding the close connection of an ADNP to the notion of “value”, which is the result of specification, is crucial for the explanation of the pronoun choice in the *whoever*-clause. It has also been pointed out that consideration of the degree of identification helps to distinguish the kind of information required for the identification of the referent of an ADNP from that required for the identification of the referent of an RDNP. The gradation between these two kinds of identificational information requires further analysis.

*This research was supported by a Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (KAKENHI) (C) #22520406. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at the 17th Meeting of The Keio Semantics and Pragmatics Research Group (September 4, 2010, Keio University, Tokyo) and Cognitive Linguistics Conference: Beyond Dichotomies (October 25, 2010, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest). I am grateful to Professor Gregory K. Jember and Associate Professor Zonia Luann Mitchell for acting as native-speaker informants and for suggesting stylistic improvements.

Notes

1) Nishiyama (1997: 766) points out that the sentence in (9) is also interpreted as predication when the definite NP is used referentially. In the following dialogue,

- (i) A: Who is the man drinking a martini?
B: He is Peter Brown.

A's sentence can be roughly paraphrased as (ii),

(ii) What name does the man drinking a martini have?

and B's sentence, as (iii).

(iii) He is the bearer of the name 'Peter Brown.'

The distinction between the identificational reading and the predecatinal reading should be further investigated.

2) According to Higgins (1979: 271-273), this sentence has the following set of readings when *the loser* is stressed:

(i) The winner of the election might have been the LOser.

(a)	RDNP	RDNP	(identity statement)
(b)	RDNP	ADNP	(identity statement)
(c)	ADNP	RDNP	(identity statement)
(d)	ADNP	ADNP	(identity statement)
(e)	superscriptional NP	RDNP	(specificational sentence)
(f)	superscriptional NP	ADNP	(specificational sentence)
(g)	RDNP	predicational NP	(predicational sentence)
(f)	ADNP	predicational NP	(predicational sentence)

3) It is interesting to note in this connection that Barwise and Perry (1983: 156) explicitly state that the attributive use is one where you can always add a parenthetical **WHOEVER IT IS**.

References

- Baker, Carl L. (1968) *Indirect Questions in English*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois.
- Barwise, Jon and John Perry (1983) *Situations and Attitudes*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Bezuidenhout, Anne (1997) "Pragmatics, semantic underdetermination and the referential / attributive distinction," *Mind*, vol.106, 375-409.
- Declerck, Renaat (1988) *Studies on Copular Sentences, Clefts and Pseudo-Clefts*, Leuven University Press, Leuven.
- Donnellan, Keith (1966) "Reference and definite descriptions," Reprinted in *Pragmatics, A Reader*, ed. by Stephen Davis, 52-64, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1991.
- Gundel, Jeanette K. (1977) "Where do cleft sentences come from?," *Language* 53, 543-559.
- Higgins, Francis R. (1979) *The Pseudo-Cleft Construction in English*, Garland, New York.
- Kumamoto, Chiaki (1993) "The referential / attributive distinction and the classification of copular sentences," *Gengogaku kara no Chyoobo* (Views from Linguistics), ed. by Fukuoka Linguistic Circle, 175-189, Kyushu University Press, Fukuoka.
- Nishiyama, Yuji (1997) "Attributive us and non-referential NPs," in *Studies in English Linguistics, A Festschrift for Akira Ota on the Occasion of His eightieth Birthday*, 752-767, The Taishukan Publishing Company, Tokyo.
- Nishiyama, Yuji (2003) *Nihongo Meishiku no Imiron to Goyooron* (Semantics and Pragmatics of Noun Phrases in Japanese), Hitsuji Shoboo, Tokyo.
- Powell, George (1999) "The referential-attributive distinction—a cognitive account," *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 11, 101-126.
- Searle, John R. (1979) "Referential and attributive," reprinted in *Pragmatics, A Reader*, ed. by Stephen Davis, 52-64, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1991.
- Stampe, Dennis W. (1974) "Attributives and interrogatives," *Semantics and Philosophy*, eds. by Milton K. Munitz and Peter K. Unger, 159-196, New York University Press, New York.